

Governance Discussion: Major points for the Working Group

- Information management system (water quality, fisheries, etc) research, management tools, not the science data system, committed to dialog, tools, education, ocean observing systems broadened to account for mgt. needs, includes biological information and human activities. Identify what is there, evaluate, gap analysis, sustained effort, priorities. Link to information to EB(F)M. Incremental value of each datum type
- Institutional structure of management. “Goods” managed on a sectorized basis, but maintaining ecosystem services require integrated agency management. Separation of science, management & allocation? Who judges the adequacy of science? What is the process to determine best available science? What should be different from SS ecosystem approach? What is the role of science & how to integrate w/mgt?

Governance Discussion: (continued)

Major points for the Working Group

- Need for standards/guidelines for ecosystems performance as a basis for management. Guiding principles for ecosystems apply at multiple scales of governance (EAM, EAF). Use of existing mechanisms (e.g., NEPA, EFH, NS 1-10) to work for EAF (doable within existing mechanisms?) Who addresses tradeoffs and what are the currencies in EAF, EAM? What can we do with current authorities, what is required for EAM? EFH should consider tropic structure etc? Putative guidelines if EAM enacted? How do cumulative impacts get assessed and acted upon?
- Defining objectives is the essential issue of defining the scope of the management system (e.g., fishery production, ecosystem-based objectives). Resource rebuilding objectives vs. tradeoffs for rebuilt resources